



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*m2*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/588,778 06/05/00 YOUNG

S	97-401
EXAMINER	

PM82/0807

BRUCE DAY  
SWANSON MIDGLEY LLC  
SUITE 400  
2420 PERSHING  
KANSAS CITY MO 64108

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SHRIVER II, J	9

DATE MAILED:

08/07/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/588,778

Applicant(s)

YOUNG, SCOT

Examiner

J. Allen Shriver

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/21/2001 and 6/7/2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 20 April 2001 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Applicant's submittal of an amendment was received on June 7, 2001; wherein Claims 1-2 and 6 were amended and new Claims 7-8 were added.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kresse et al. (US Patent 5,913,528) in view of Wells (US Patent 4,319,761).** Kresse discloses a detachable trolley and trailer combination having a trolley (1) having a frame adapted for carrying cleaning supplies (See Fig. 1) supported by wheels (4) thereon for moving over a floor surface and a trailer supported by wheels thereon and movable over a floor surface, the trolley and the trailer separately and independently movable and having a connection (5) between them for selective attachment to securely connect the trailer to the trolley so that the combined trolley and trailer can be easily maneuvered by one person.

Kresse doesn't specifically disclose the trailer being a mop bucket having wheels thereon and movable over a floor surface. Wells teaches a mop bucket connector that connects two or more mop buckets together (See Figs. 1-2). At the time of the invention, it would have been

Art Unit: 3611

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art to substitute a mop bucket for the trailer in Kreese in view of the teaching of Wells. The motivation for doing so would have been to wheel both around as a single unit, thereby greatly reducing the amount of labor involved (See Wells, column 1, lines 20-25).

### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments filed May 21, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Starting on page 2 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that the Kreese trailer is not supported by wheels and independently moveable over a floor surface. Examiner partially agrees with this argument, however, Examiner's rejection was based upon the combination of the trolley disclosed in Kreese with the substitution of the mop bucket disclosed in Wells for the trailer. Thus, the rejection based on the combination of Kreese with Wells meets the limitations specified in Claim 1.

In regards to Applicant's arguments that the combination of Kreese and Wells fails to meet the limitation requiring the trolley having spaced apart front legs terminating in wheels and forming a recess therebetween with the mop bucket sized to fit at least a portion of the mop bucket within the recess so as to nest between the spaced front legs. Examiner agrees with this argument.

Art Unit: 3611

*Allowable Subject Matter*

5. Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. Claims 6-8 are allowed.

*Conclusion*

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Allen Shriver whose telephone number is (703) 308-1224. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J.J. Swann can be reached on (703) 306-4115. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/588,778

Page 5

Art Unit: 3611

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 306-4195 for regular communications and (703) 306-4195 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

JAS

July 30, 2001



J. J. SWANN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600